

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.4887 OF 2014

Sanjay Sadubhau Dalvi

... Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra

... Respondent

Ms.Rohini Dandekar, Advocate appointed for the Petitioner
Mrs.U.V. Kejriwal, APP, for Respondent – State

CORAM: **SMT. V.K. TAHILRAMANI &
MRS.MRIDULA BHATKAR, JJ.**

DATE: **JULY 18, 2016**

ORAL ORDER (PER SMT.V.K. TAHILRAMANI, J.):

1. Heard both sides.
2. Rule. By consent, Rule is made returnable forthwith.
3. The petitioner has preferred an application for parole on 2.5.2013. The said application came to be granted by order dated 6.12.2013 and the petitioner, was released on parole on 31.5.2014 for a period of 30 days. Thereafter, the petitioner preferred his first application for extension of parole by a period of 30 days. The said application was granted. Thereafter, the petitioner preferred second application for extension of parole on 25.7.2014. The said application came to be rejected, hence, this petition.

4. The case of the petitioner is that he was suffering from problem in his eyes due to which he was blind. The medical certificate shows that the petitioner was required to undergo laser treatment for his eyes and it would require at least one month to control his glaucoma and he needs frequent follow-up. At present the petitioner is in jail. It is an admitted fact that the petitioner is blind. In view of the fact that there was complete loss of vision, in the peculiar facts and circumstances of this case, we extend the parole leave by a period of 30 days. Any prison punishment imposed on account of overstaying of 30 days is set aside.

5. Rule is made absolute in the above terms.

6. Office to communicate this order to the petitioner who is in Nashik Road Central Prison.

7. Fees to be paid to the appointed advocate are quantified at Rs.2,500/-.

(MRIDULA BHATKAR, J.)

(V.K. TAHILRAMANI, J.)